

### REMARKS

The above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 2, 2005. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

#### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-15 are under consideration in this application. Claim 1 is being amended without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### Additional Amendments

The specification and the claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better disclose or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

#### Formality Rejection

The Abstract and the specification were objected to for various informalities. Claim 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement, and further under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Regarding the rejections base upon the "sleeve antenna," Applicants hereby enclose a publication by the US Department of Justice entitled "Antenna System Guide: NIJ Guide 202-00," which enables one skilled in the art to use a sleeve antenna at microwave frequencies by using a length thereof described in paragraph 5.2 on page 18, lines 408 and Fig. 7(a).

Claim 1 is being amended to recite more than one means as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejections is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

### Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

---

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**July 21, 2005**

SPF/JCM/JT